



**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein is respectfully requested.

**A. ELECTION REQUIREMENT**

The Applicant hereby confirms the election of the Group I Invention, claims 1, and 22-45.

The non-elected claims 46-50 have been cancelled.

**B. STATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING**

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being directed to the identical invention as claim 1 in U.S. Patent No. 5,882,729. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,882,729 reads as follows:

1. In a process for producing a casing which can be opened and closed several times providing a screen against electromagnetic radiation for objects to be encased therein, the casing including a screening profile arranged in a given opening portion of at least one casing part, said screening profile comprising materials having different elastic and conductive properties, the improvement characterized in that

the materials are dispensed automatically under pressure through a conduit, directly onto the opening portion of the casing part on which the screening profile is to be arranged forming automatically a screening profile having a predetermined shape and cross section without the use of a mold so that the screening profile is not affected by opening and closing of the casing;

wherein said screening profile is multi-layered and the conduit is guided several times at least over predetermined regions of the portion on which the screening profile is to be arranged, so that a predetermined cross-section is built up from several layers which together form said screening profile and;

wherein the different elastic materials are applied when the conduit is guided over said predetermined regions, the conductive material being applied in at least one layer.

Claim 1 in the subject application does not contain the limitations undefined above and therefore it is not drawn to the identical invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that statutory double patenting is not applicable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 23 and 35 as being directed to the identical invention as claim 9 in U.S. Patent No. 6,329,014. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,329,014 read as follows:

1. A method for the manufacture of a housing having two adjacent housing parts for accommodating electronic functional elements (2), comprising:

forming a screening seal (8; 8') to fill a gap between said two adjacent housing parts, said seal being made from an electrically conductive elastic plastic material, said electrically conductive elastic plastic material including a silicon polymer that dries rapidly in air and at ambient temperature, said forming including ejecting said polymer in a pasty initial state with a pressure nozzle and passing said pressure nozzle over one of said housing portions that is to be sealed, so that said polymer is deposited directly on said one of said housing portions (3a), to form said screening seal with a predetermined profile (8; 8') without a molding tool; and allowing said screening seal to cure on said one of said housing portions wherein said screening seal adheres to a surface of said one of said portions in such a manner that the screening seal maintains its electrical and sealing characteristics even after repeated opening of the housing.

2. The method according to claim 1, further comprising forming said screening seal by passing said nozzle several times at least over predetermined regions of said one of said portions to form said screening seal with said profile having a predetermined cross-section.

9. The method of claim 2 wherein one of said housing portions includes a printed circuit board, further comprising forming said screening seal with said printed circuit board.

From this description it is clear that claims 1, 2, and 9 of the '014 patent pertain to a method including forming a seal between two housing parts and a printed circuit board. Claim 22 recites a method including forming a seal between a housing part and a printed circuit board. The same argument is applicable to claim 35. It is respectfully submitted that neither claim 22 nor claim 35 claim the identical invention as claim 9 in the '014 patent.

#### C. OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 22, 24-34, and 36-45 are rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 729 and '014 mentioned above.

In response, the Applicants hereby submit an appropriate Terminal Disclaimer.

**D. CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claim 22 has been amended as requested by the Examiner to overcome the confusion.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby states that by the amendments made hereinabove, no new matter is being added to the subject application.

Applicant respectfully requests entry into the record of the above.

Dated: June 13, 2005  
New York, New York

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN PC  
Attorneys for Applicant  
270 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10016-0601  
Telephone: (212) 684 3900  
Telefax: (212) 684 3999

By: 

WEISZ, Tiberiu  
Reg. No. 29,876

Enclosure: Terminal Disclaimer

S:\belinda\amend\rule111\glawe\49225.doc